

**From:** Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US  
**Sent:** 4/6/2012 1:49:11 PM  
**To:** rpennell@ap.org  
**CC:** Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US@EPA  
**BCC:** David Bloomgren/DC/USEPA/US  
**Subject:** RE: Update on latest water sampling data from Dimock, Pa.

Randy -- I hope this helps you out. -- Roy

1) Broadly speaking, are these results the same as those received for the first 11 homes?

To date, we have completed analytical results for a second group of 20 homes, in addition to those for the first 11 homes that were sampled. Neither round of sampling showed levels that would give us reason to take immediate action.

2) I have to admit I'm a little confused by the chart you've posted -- I can't tell which of the wells were part of the first 11 and which came after. And I'm having a little difficulty synthesizing it into words. Can you tell me how many wells showed the presence of various substances, including sodium, methane, chromium, bacteria and arsenic? As far as I can tell from the chart, it doesn't look like any of those levels were too high for primary or secondary water standards. I see highlighted substances for some wells with concentrations over a "trigger level." Would it be fair then to call those levels elevated, but not dangerous?

Here is a little more information about what the second set of findings indicated:

- \* One of the 20 wells sampled had levels of sodium above EPA's recommended concentration of sodium in drinking water of between 30,000 and 60,000 micrograms per cubic liter (ug/l). At this well, the residents are currently receiving alternate sources of drinking water from Cabot.

- \* Eight of the 20 wells sampled had levels of sodium above EPA's guidance of 20,000 ug/l for individuals with a restricted sodium intake of 500 mg/day.

EPA's Drinking Water Advisory for sodium recommends reducing sodium concentrations in drinking water to between 30,000 and 60,000 ug/l based on esthetic effects such as taste. Drinking water containing between 30,000 and 60,000 ug/l is unlikely to be perceived as salty by most individuals and would contribute only 2.5% to 5% of the dietary goal if tap water consumption is 2 L/day. This recommendation is not federally enforceable but is intended as a guideline for states. States may establish higher or lower levels depending on local conditions, such as unavailability of alternate source waters or other compelling factors, provided that public health and welfare are not adversely affected.

EPA also has a 20,000 ug/l guideline that is currently used as a health-based guide for individuals whose dietary intake of sodium is severely restricted at a level of 500 mg of sodium from all dietary sources daily. In this scenario, an individual could drink 2 liters of water each day, and consume only 40 mg of sodium from that water - only a small portion of their total intake, even at 500 mg daily. This guidance is not a regulatory standard and does not apply to the general population.

- \* Three of the 20 homes had levels of methane above the federal Office of Surface Mining's screening level of 28 parts per million. One of these homes is currently receiving alternate sources of drinking water from Cabot. EPA has notified the two residences where the water was being used in the home and the residents indicated they were already aware that their water contained levels of methane.

- \* One of the 20 homes had levels of barium in the drinking water well above EPA's Maximum Contaminant

Level of 2,000 ug/l. The resident was already aware of the higher levels of barium and has a reverse osmosis treatment system installed that is successfully removing barium from the water.

Also, can you tell me how many of these 20 homes were receiving water deliveries and if those will continue?

EPA has not been providing bottled water to any of the 20 residents. However, some of the resident may have agreements with Cabot to receive an alternate source of water.

We had reported that three of the 11 homes that already had results returned were receiving water and would continue to do so. Is that still the case?

Yes, that is accurate. EPA is conducting a second round of sampling at these three homes.

Roy Seneca  
EPA Region 3 Press Officer  
Office of Public Affairs  
seneca.roy@epa.gov  
(215) 814-5567

From: "Pennell, Randy" <rpennell@ap.org>  
To: Roy Seneca/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, "Rubinkam, Michael" <mrubinkam@ap.org>, "PHI - Philadelphia, PA Bureau Mailbox" <PHI-PhiladelphiaPABureauMailbox@ap.org>  
Cc: Terri-A White/R3/USEPA/US@EPA, "Walters, Patrick" <pwalters@ap.org>, "Moore, Matt" <MMoore@ap.org>  
Date: 04/06/2012 12:50 PM  
Subject: RE: Update on latest water sampling data from Dimock, Pa.

Roy,

Thank you. Unfortunately, Mike is off at the moment and he's been our go-to guy on anything Dimock-related.

Broadly speaking, are these results the same as those received for the first 11 homes?

I have to admit I'm a little confused by the chart you've posted -- I can't tell which of the wells were part of the first 11 and which came after. And I'm having a little difficulty synthesizing it into words.

Can you tell me how many wells showed the presence of various substances, including sodium, methane, chromium, bacteria and arsenic? As far as I can tell from the chart, it doesn't look like any of those levels were too high for primary or secondary water standards. I see highlighted substances for some wells with concentrations over a "trigger level." Would it be fair then to call those levels elevated, but not dangerous?

Also, can you tell me how many of these 20 homes were receiving water deliveries and if those will continue? We had reported that three of the 11 homes that already had results returned were receiving water and would continue to do so. Is that still the case?

Sorry if these are things that should be self-explanatory.

Thanks!

Randy

**From:** Roy Seneca [mailto:Seneca.Roy@epamail.epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Friday, April 06, 2012 12:31 PM  
**To:** Rubinkam, Michael; Pennell, Randy; PHI - Philadelphia, PA Bureau Mailbox  
**Cc:** Terri-A White  
**Subject:** Update on latest water sampling data from Dimock, Pa.

EPA has completed and shared with residents and Pennsylvania state officials the second set of sampling at 20 private drinking water wells in Dimock, Pa. This set of sampling did not show levels of contaminants that would give EPA reason to take immediate action. EPA remains committed to providing Dimock residents with the best available data and information on the quality of drinking water as expeditiously as possible.

For more information on the sampling results, visit: <http://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/states/pa.html>

Roy Seneca  
EPA Region 3 Press Officer  
Office of Public Affairs  
[seneca.roy@epa.gov](mailto:seneca.roy@epa.gov)  
(215) 814-5567

The information contained in this communication is intended for the use of the designated recipients named above. If the reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that you have received this communication in error, and that any review, dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify The Associated Press immediately by telephone at +1-212-621-1898 and delete this email. Thank you.

[IP\_US\_DISC]

msk dccc60c6d2c3a6438f0cf467d9a4938